arXiv:1611.09202v1 [math.FA] 23 Nov 2016

A variational model with fractional-order regularization term arising in registration of diffusion tensor image [*] [†]

Huan Han

Wuhan Insitute of Physics and Mathematics, Chinese Academy of Sciences,

P.O. Box 71010, Wuhan, 430071, China

Abstract

In this paper, a new variational model with fractional-order regularization term arising in registration of diffusion tensor image(DTI) is presented. Moreover, the existence of its solution is proved to ensure that there is a regular solution for this model.

Keywords: variation, DTI registration, fractional-order derivatives.
MSC2010: 68U10, 62H35, 74G65, 94A08, 97M10, 58E05, 49J45, 49J35.

1 Introduction

Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^3$ be an open bounded domain, i.e., $\Omega = (a_1, b_1) \times (a_2, b_2) \times (a_3, b_3)$. Suppose T and D are two functions defined from Ω to the set of 3×3 real Symmetric Positive Definite matrixes($SPD(3)$ in short). That is,

$$T : \Omega \to SPD(3), \quad D : \Omega \to SPD(3). \tag{1.1}$$

In DTI registration, T and D are viewed as two images defined on Ω, where T is called floating image and D is called target image. The goal of registration is to find a 1-to-1 spatial transformation $h : \Omega \to \Omega$ such that $T \circ h(\cdot)$ is close to $D(\cdot)$ in some sense. On the other hand, in order to keep $T \circ h(\cdot)$ align with spatial transformation, reorientation of $T \circ h(\cdot)$ must be additionally considered. For this purpose, Alexander[1] put forward two reorientation strategies: finite strain(FS) strategy and preservation principle direction(PPD) strategy. Based on FS strategy, Li[8] introduced a new operator "$\diamond$" defined by

$$T \diamond h(x) = R[T \circ h(x)]R^T \text{ with } R = J^T(JJ^T)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \text{ and } J = \nabla_x h^{-1}(x). \tag{1.2}$$

With the help of this operator, the DTI registration model(cf. [6]) can be formulated as

$$\bar{v} = \arg\min_v \bar{H}(v), \tag{1.3}$$

[*]Email: hanhuan11@mails.ucas.ac.cn (H. Han)

[†]This work was supported by NSFC under grant No.11471331 and partially supported by National Center for Mathematics and Interdisciplinary Sciences.

where $\bar{H}(v) = \int_0^\tau \|Lv(\cdot,t)\|^2_{L^2(\Omega)}dt + \|T \diamond h(\cdot) - D(\cdot)\|^2_{L^2(\Omega)}$, $L : [H_0^3(\Omega)]^3 \to [L^2(\Omega)]^3$ is a linear differential operator satisfing

$$\|Lv(\cdot,t)\|^2_{L^2(\Omega)} \triangleq \sum_{i=1}^{3} \int_\Omega |(Lv)_i(x,t)|^2 dx \geq c\|v(\cdot,t)\|^2_{[H_0^3(\Omega)]^3}, \tag{1.4}$$

for some constant $c > 0$, and

$$\frac{d\eta(s;t,x)}{ds} = v(\eta(s;t,x),s),\ \eta(t;t,x) = x \ \text{ and } \ h(x) = \eta(0;\tau,x). \tag{1.5}$$

Remark 1.1. Note that in (1.2), R, J and $T \circ h(x)$ are all 3×3 matrixes with $h^{-1}(x) = \eta(\tau;0,x)$ and $J = \nabla_x \eta(\tau;0,x)$ (cf. [6]). Here the existence of function h^{-1} is given by **(ii)** in Lemma 3.5 and the definition of $(JJ^T)^{-\frac{1}{2}}$ can refer to Appendix in [6]. □

In [6], authors prove that there exists a solution to variational problem (1.3)-(1.5) on some suitable space. Note that almost all the DTI registration model[8, 14] have employed integer-order derivatives in linear differential operator L. In fact, during the last decades, it has been showed that many problems involving science and engineering can be modeled more accurately by employing fractional-order derivatives[11, 13, 16] than integer-order derivatives. Motivated by this fact, the aim of this paper is to employ fractional-order derivatives in DTI registration model.

Before giving our results, we introduce some notations and definitions.

Throughout this paper, we define $\Omega \triangleq (a_1,b_1) \times (a_2,b_2) \times (a_3,b_3) \subset \mathbb{R}^3$. Moreover, for $x \in \Omega$, the inner product and modulus of matrix $A(x) = (a_{ij}(x))_{n\times m}$, $B = (b_{ij}(x))_{n\times m}$ are defined as

$$A(x) \cdot B(x) = \sum_{i=1}^{n}\sum_{j=1}^{m} a_{ij}(x)b_{ij}(x), \quad \|A(x)\| = \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^{n}\sum_{j=1}^{m} a_{ij}^2(x)},$$

respectively.

Furthermore, we say $A(x)$ is continuous on Ω if $a_{ij}(x)(i = 1,2,\cdots,n; j = 1,2,\cdots,m)$ are continuous on Ω.

Moreover, for matrix sequence $A_k(x) = \left(a_{ij}^k(x)\right)_{n\times m}$, we say $A_k(x) \xrightarrow{k} A(x)$ if $a_{ij}^k(x) \xrightarrow{k} a_{ij}(x)(i = 1,2,\cdots,n; j = 1,2,\cdots,m)$.

Based on definition of Riemann-Liouville derivative in [4], for $x = (x_1,x_2,x_3) \in \Omega$ and function $f : \Omega \to \mathbb{R}$, define

$$\frac{\partial^\alpha f(x)}{\partial x_i^\alpha} \triangleq D^\alpha_{[a_i,x_i]} f(x) = \frac{1}{\Gamma([\alpha]+1-\alpha)} \left(\frac{d}{dx_i}\right)^{[\alpha]+1} \int_{a_i}^{x_i} \frac{f^{(i)}(x,t)}{(x_i-t)^{\alpha-[\alpha]}} dt,$$

$$\frac{\partial^{\alpha*} f(x)}{\partial x_i^{\alpha*}} \triangleq D^\alpha_{[x_i,b_i]} f(x) = \frac{1}{\Gamma([\alpha]+1-\alpha)} \left(-\frac{d}{dx_i}\right)^{[\alpha]+1} \int_{x_i}^{b_i} \frac{f^{(i)}(x,t)}{(t-x_i)^{\alpha-[\alpha]}} dt,$$

where $\Gamma(s) = \int_0^{+\infty} x^{s-1}e^{-x}dx$, $[\cdot]$ is round down function, here and in what follows, $f^{(1)}(x,t) = f(t,x_2,x_3)$, $f^{(2)}(x,t) = f(x_1,t,x_3)$, $f^{(3)}(x,t) = f(x_1,x_2,t)$ and $i = 1,2,3$.

Definition 1.1. For $\alpha > 0$ and function $g : \Omega \to \mathbb{R}$, define semi-norms

$$|g|_{F_L^\alpha(\Omega)} = \left(\int_\Omega \|\nabla^\alpha g(x)\|^2 dx\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}, |g|_{F_R^\alpha(\Omega)} = \left(\int_\Omega \|\nabla^{\alpha*} g(x)\|^2 dx\right)^{\frac{1}{2}},$$

and norms

$$\|g\|_{F_L^\alpha(\Omega)} = \left(\|g\|^2_{L^2(\Omega)} + |g|^2_{F_L^\alpha(\Omega)}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}, \|g\|_{F_R^\alpha(\Omega)} = \left(\|g\|^2_{L^2(\Omega)} + |g|^2_{F_R^\alpha(\Omega)}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}},$$

where $\nabla^\alpha g(x) = \left(\frac{\partial^\alpha g(x)}{\partial x_i^\alpha}\right)_{1\times 3}$ and $\nabla^{\alpha *} g(x) = \left(\frac{\partial^{\alpha *} g(x)}{\partial x_i^{\alpha *}}\right)_{1\times 3}$.

Based on Definition 1.1, define space $F^\alpha_{L,0}(\Omega)$ and $F^\alpha_{R,0}(\Omega)$ as the closure of $C_0^\infty(\Omega)$ under the norm $\|\cdot\|_{F^\alpha_{L,0}(\Omega)}$ and $\|\cdot\|_{F^\alpha_{R,0}(\Omega)}$, respectively.

Definition 1.2. For $\alpha > 0$ and $u \in L^1(\mathbb{R}^3)$, define the semi-norm and norm

$$|u|_{H^\alpha(\mathbb{R}^3)} = \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \|\xi\|^{2\alpha} |\widehat{u}(\xi)|^2 d\xi\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}, \quad \|u\|_{H^\alpha(\mathbb{R}^3)} = \left(\|u\|^2_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)} + |u|^2_{H^\alpha(\mathbb{R}^3)}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}},$$

where here and in what follows, $\widehat{u}(\xi) = \frac{1}{(2\pi)^{\frac{3}{2}}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} u(x) e^{-x\cdot\xi} dx$.

Define Sobolev space $H^\alpha(\mathbb{R}^3)$ as the closure of $C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^3)$ under the norm $\|\cdot\|_{H^\alpha(\mathbb{R}^3)}$.

In Definition 1.2, if we restrict $\mathbb{R}^3$ to Ω, then $H_0^\alpha(\Omega)$ is the closure of $C_0^\infty(\Omega)$ under the norm $\|\cdot\|_{H_0^\alpha(\Omega)}$.

For $\tau > 0$, $\alpha > 2.5$, $\alpha \neq m + 0.5$, $m \in \mathbb{N}$ and $u : \Omega \times [0, \tau] \to \mathbb{R}^3$, define a separable Hilbert space

$$\mathcal{F} \triangleq \{u(x,t) = (u_i(x,t))_{1\times 3} : u_i(x,t) \in F^\alpha_{L,0}(\Omega) \text{ for any } t \in [0,\tau] \text{ and } i = 1,2,3\},$$

endowing with the following inner product and norm

$$(u,v)_{\mathcal{F}} = \int_0^\tau \int_\Omega \nabla^\alpha u(x,t) \cdot \nabla^\alpha v(x,t) dx dt, \quad \|u\|^2_{\mathcal{F}} = \int_0^\tau \|\nabla^\alpha u(\cdot,t)\|^2_{L^2(\Omega)} dt,$$

where $\nabla^\alpha u(x,t) = \left(\frac{\partial^\alpha u_i(x,t)}{\partial x_j^\alpha}\right)_{3\times 3}$.

Based on the above notations and definitions, the variational model with fractional-order regularization term arising in registration of diffusion tensor image(DTI) can be formulated as

$$\bar{v} = \arg\min_{v\in\mathcal{F}} H(v), \tag{1.6}$$

where $H(v) = \int_0^\tau \|\nabla^\alpha v(\cdot,t)\|^2_{L^2(\Omega)} dt + \|T \diamond h(\cdot) - D(\cdot)\|^2_{L^2(\Omega)}$ and $h(x)$ is defined by (1.5).

Another purpose of this paper is to give a rigid proof on the existence of solution to (1.6). As to this problem, we have the following result:

Theorem 1.1. *Let T and D be two functions defined by (1.1), and let the set $\triangle_T \triangleq \{x : T(\cdot)$ is discontinuous at $x\}$ be a set of measure zero. If $\max\limits_{x\in\Omega} \|T(x)\| < +\infty$, $G \triangleq \max\limits_{x\in\Omega} \|T(x) - D(x)\|^2 < +\infty$, then the variational problem (1.6) admits a solution $\bar{v}(x,s) \in \mathcal{F}$ with $\|\bar{v}\|^2_{\mathcal{F}} \leq G|\Omega|$. Furthermore, by (1.5), $\bar{v}(x,s)$ induces a 1-to-1 and onto mapping $\bar{h}(x) \in [C^{[\alpha-1.5],\lambda}(\Omega)]^3$ defined from Ω to Ω, where $0 < \lambda \leq \alpha - 1.5 - [\alpha - 1.5]$. Moreover, $\nabla_x \bar{h}(x)$ is given by Lemma 3.5.*

Remark 1.2. In fact, if $H(v)$ in (1.6) is formulated as

$$H(v) = \int_0^\tau \|\nabla^{\alpha *} v(\cdot,t)\|^2_{L^2(\Omega)} dt + \|T \diamond h(\cdot) - D(\cdot)\|^2_{L^2(\Omega)},$$

then there also exists a global minimizer to $H(v)$ on space

$$\mathcal{F}_1 \triangleq \{u(x,t) = (u_i(x,t))_{1\times 3} : u_i(x,t) \in F^{\alpha}_{R,0}(\Omega) \text{ for any } t \in [0,\tau] \text{ and } i = 1,2,3\},$$

endowing with the following inner product and norm

$$(u,v)_{\mathcal{F}_1} = \int_0^{\tau}\int_{\Omega} \nabla^{\alpha *} u(x,t)\cdot\nabla^{\alpha *} v(x,t)dxdt, \quad \|u\|^2_{\mathcal{F}_1} = \int_0^{\tau} \|\nabla^{\alpha *} u(\cdot,t)\|^2_{L^2(\Omega)}dt,$$

where $\alpha > 2.5$, $\alpha \neq m + 0.5$, $m \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\nabla^{\alpha *} u(x,t) = \left(\frac{\partial^{\alpha *} u_i(x,t)}{\partial x_j^{\alpha *}}\right)_{3\times 3}$.

2 Equivalence of $F^{\alpha}_{L,0}(\Omega)$, $F^{\alpha}_{R,0}(\Omega)$ and $H^{\alpha}_0(\Omega)$

In [6], authors impose the condition (1.4) on L such that $v(\cdot,t) \in [H^3_0(\Omega)]^3 \hookrightarrow [C^1(\Omega)]^3$ which ensures the existence and uniqueness of solution to (1.5). As the basic space of this paper, $F^{\alpha}_{L,0}(\Omega)$ and $F^{\alpha}_{R,0}(\Omega)$ are also needed to embedded into $C^1(\Omega)$. Otherwise, the uniqueness of solution to (1.5) can not be guaranteed[12].

For this purpose, we will prove the equivalence of $F^{\alpha}_{L,0}(\Omega)$, $F^{\alpha}_{R,0}(\Omega)$ and $H^{\alpha}_0(\Omega)$, since $H^{\alpha}(\Omega) \hookrightarrow C^1(\Omega)(\alpha > 2.5)$(cf. [2, Theorem 4.57]).

First, we introduce some definitions.

Definition 2.1. For $\alpha > 0$ and function $g : \mathbb{R}^3 \to \mathbb{R}$, define the semi-norms

$$|g|_{F^{\alpha}_L(\mathbb{R}^3)} = \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \|D^{\alpha} g(x)\|^2 dx\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}, \quad |g|_{F^{\alpha}_R(\mathbb{R}^3)} = \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \|D^{\alpha *} g(x)\|^2 dx\right)^{\frac{1}{2}},$$

and norms

$$\|g\|_{F^{\alpha}_L(\mathbb{R}^3)} = \left(\|g\|^2_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)} + |g|^2_{F^{\alpha}_L(\mathbb{R}^3)}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}, \|g\|_{F^{\alpha}_R(\mathbb{R}^3)} = \left(\|g\|^2_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)} + |g|^2_{F^{\alpha}_R(\mathbb{R}^3)}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}},$$

where $D^{\alpha} g(x) = (D^{\alpha}_j g(x))_{1\times 3}$, $D^{\alpha *} g(x) = (D^{\alpha *}_j g(x))_{1\times 3}$ and

$$D^{\alpha}_j g(x) = \frac{1}{\Gamma([\alpha]+1-\alpha)}\left(\frac{d}{dx_j}\right)^{[\alpha]+1}\int_{-\infty}^{x_j} \frac{g^{(j)}(x,t)}{(x_j - t)^{\alpha-[\alpha]}}dt, \tag{2.1}$$

$$D^{\alpha *}_j g(x) = \frac{1}{\Gamma([\alpha]+1-\alpha)}\left(-\frac{d}{dx_j}\right)^{[\alpha]+1}\int_{x_j}^{+\infty} \frac{g^{(j)}(x,t)}{(t - x_j)^{\alpha-[\alpha]}}dt. \tag{2.2}$$

Define $F^{\alpha}_L(\mathbb{R}^3)$, $F^{\alpha}_R(\mathbb{R}^3)$ as the closure of $C^{\infty}_0(\mathbb{R}^3)$ under the norm $\|\cdot\|_{F^{\alpha}_L(\mathbb{R}^3)}$ and $\|\cdot\|_{F^{\alpha}_R(\mathbb{R}^3)}$, respectively.

Definition 2.2. For $\alpha > 0$ and function $g : \mathbb{R}^3 \to \mathbb{R}$, define semi-norm

$$|g|_{F^{\alpha}_S(\mathbb{R}^3)} = \left|\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} D^{\alpha} g(x)\cdot D^{\alpha *} g(x)dx\right|^{\frac{1}{2}}, \tag{2.3}$$

and norm

$$\|g\|_{F^{\alpha}_S(\mathbb{R}^3)} = \left(\|g\|^2_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)} + |g|^2_{F^{\alpha}_S(\mathbb{R}^3)}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}. \tag{2.4}$$

Define $F^{\alpha}_S(\mathbb{R}^3)$ as the closure of $C^{\infty}_0(\mathbb{R}^3)$ under the norm $\|\cdot\|_{F^{\alpha}_S(\mathbb{R}^3)}$.

If we restrict $\mathbb{R}^3$ to Ω and replace $D^{\alpha} g(x)$, $D^{\alpha *} g(x)$ with $\nabla^{\alpha} g(x)$, $\nabla^{\alpha *} g(x)$ in (2.3) respectively, then $F^{\alpha}_{S,0}(\Omega)$ is defined similarly.

Lemma 2.1. *For $\alpha > 0$ and $\xi = (\xi_1, \xi_2, \xi_3) \in \mathbb{R}^3$, there holds*

$$\frac{1}{3}\|\xi^\alpha\|^2 \le \|\xi\|^{2\alpha} \le 3\|\xi^\alpha\|^2, \tag{2.5}$$

where $\xi^\alpha = (\xi_1^\alpha, \xi_2^\alpha, \xi_3^\alpha)$.

Proof. Since $\|\xi\|^{2\alpha} = \left(\xi_1^2 + \xi_2^2 + \xi_3^2\right)^\alpha \ge \xi_j^{2\alpha} (j = 1, 2, 3)$, then there holds

$$\frac{1}{3}\|\xi^\alpha\|^2 = \frac{1}{3}(\xi_1^{2\alpha} + \xi_2^{2\alpha} + \xi_3^{2\alpha}) \le \|\xi\|^{2\alpha}. \tag{2.6}$$

On the other hand, $\|\xi\|^{2\alpha} \le 3 \max\limits_{j=1,2,3} \xi_j^{2\alpha}$ implies that

$$\|\xi\|^{2\alpha} \le 3(\xi_1^{2\alpha} + \xi_2^{2\alpha} + \xi_3^{2\alpha}) = 3\|\xi^\alpha\|^2. \tag{2.7}$$

Lemma 2.2. *Assume $\alpha > 0$, $\xi = (\xi_1, \xi_2, \xi_3) \in \mathbb{R}^3$, then*

$$\widehat{(D_j^\alpha f)}(\xi) = (i\xi_j)^\alpha \widehat{f}(\xi), \quad \widehat{(D_j^{\alpha *} f)}(\xi) = (-i\xi_j)^\alpha \widehat{f}(\xi) \ (j = 1, 2, 3). \tag{2.8}$$

Proof. For function $g : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ and $\chi \in \mathbb{R}$, by Appendix in [4], we know

$$\widehat{(D^\alpha g)}(\chi) = (i\chi)^\alpha \widehat{g}(\chi), \quad \widehat{(D^{\alpha *} g)}(\chi) = (-i\chi)^\alpha \widehat{g}(\chi), \tag{2.9}$$

where $\widehat{g}(\chi) = \frac{1}{(2\pi)^{\frac{1}{2}}} \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} g(y) e^{-iy\chi} dy$.

Based on this conclusion, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\widehat{(D_1^\alpha f)}(\xi) =& \frac{1}{(2\pi)^{\frac{3}{2}}} \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} D_1^\alpha f(x_1, x_2, x_3) e^{-i \sum\limits_{j=1}^{3} x_j \xi_j} dx_1 dx_2 dx_3 \\
=& \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} \left[\frac{1}{(2\pi)^{\frac{1}{2}}} \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} D_1^\alpha f(x_1, x_2, x_3) e^{-ix_1\xi_1} dx_1 \right] e^{-i \sum\limits_{j=2}^{3} x_j \xi_j} dx_2 dx_3 \\
=& \frac{1}{(2\pi)^{\frac{3}{2}}} \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} \left[(i\xi_1)^\alpha \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} f(x_1, x_2, x_3) e^{-ix_1\xi_1} dx_1 \right] e^{-i \sum\limits_{j=2}^{3} x_j \xi_j} dx_2 dx_3 \\
=& (i\xi_1)^\alpha \frac{1}{(2\pi)^{\frac{3}{2}}} \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} f(x_1, x_2, x_3) e^{-i \sum\limits_{j=1}^{3} x_j \xi_j} dx_1 dx_2 dx_3 \\
=& (i\xi_1)^\alpha \widehat{f}(\xi).
\end{aligned} \tag{2.10}$$

Similarly, we can prove that $\widehat{(D_j^\alpha f)}(\xi) = (i\xi_j)^\alpha \widehat{f}(\xi) (j = 2, 3)$.

With the help of the second equality of (2.9), we can prove that

$$\widehat{(D_j^{\alpha *} f)}(\xi) = (-i\xi_j)^\alpha \widehat{f}(\xi) (j = 1, 2, 3). \tag{2.11}$$

Lemma 2.3. *Assume $\alpha > 0$, then $F_L^\alpha(\mathbb{R}^3)$, $F_R^\alpha(\mathbb{R}^3)$ and $H^\alpha(\mathbb{R}^3)$ are equivalent.*

Proof. By Lemma 2.2 and Plancherel Theorem[5, Theorem 1 in Section 4.3],

$$\begin{aligned}|f|^2_{F^\alpha_L(\mathbb{R}^3)} &= \sum_{j=1}^{3} \|D^\alpha_j f\|^2_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)} = \sum_{j=1}^{3} \|\widehat{(D^\alpha_j f)}\|^2_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)} = \sum_{j=1}^{3} \||\xi_j|^\alpha \widehat{f}(\xi)\|^2_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)} \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \left|\widehat{f}(\xi)\right|^2 \sum_{j=1}^{3} |\xi_j|^{2\alpha} d\xi = \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \left|\widehat{f}(\xi)\right|^2 \|\xi^\alpha\|^2 d\xi. \end{aligned} \tag{2.12}$$

By Lemma 2.1, we know that $F^\alpha_L(\mathbb{R}^3)$ and $H^\alpha(\mathbb{R}^3)$ are equivalent.
In a similar way, we can prove that $F^\alpha_R(\mathbb{R}^3)$ and $H^\alpha(\mathbb{R}^3)$ are equivalent.

Lemma 2.4. *Assume $\alpha > 0$ and let $f(x)$ be a function defined from $\mathbb{R}^3$ to $\mathbb{R}$, then*

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} D^\alpha f(x) \cdot D^{\alpha *} f(x) dx = \cos(\pi\alpha) \|D^\alpha f\|^2_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)}. \tag{2.13}$$

Proof. By Parseval equality[5, Theorem 2 in Section 4.3]

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}} u\bar{v} dx = \int_{\mathbb{R}} \widehat{u}(\xi)\overline{\widehat{v}(\xi)} d\xi, \tag{2.14}$$

we have,

$$\begin{aligned}\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} D^\alpha_1 f(x) \cdot D^{\alpha *}_1 f(x) dx &= \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty}\int_{-\infty}^{+\infty}\int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} D^\alpha_1 f(x)\overline{D^{\alpha *}_1 f(x)} dx_1 dx_2 dx_3 \\ &= \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty}\int_{-\infty}^{+\infty}\left[\int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} D^\alpha_1 f(x)\overline{D^{\alpha *}_1 f(x)} dx_1\right] dx_2 dx_3 \\ &= \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty}\int_{-\infty}^{+\infty}\left[\int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} \widehat{(D^\alpha_1 f)}(\xi_1)\overline{\widehat{(D^{\alpha *}_1 f)}(\xi_1)} d\xi_1\right] dx_2 dx_3, \end{aligned} \tag{2.15}$$

where $\widehat{(D^\alpha_1 f)}(\xi_1) = \frac{1}{(2\pi)^{\frac{1}{2}}}\int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} D^\alpha_1 f(x) e^{-ix_1\xi_1} dx_1$, $\widehat{(D^{\alpha *}_1 f)}(\xi_1) = \frac{1}{(2\pi)^{\frac{1}{2}}}\int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} D^{\alpha *}_1 f(x) e^{-ix_1\xi_1} dx_1$.

On the other hand, we know

$$\overline{(iw)^\alpha} = \begin{cases} e^{-i\pi\alpha}\overline{(-iw)^\alpha} & if\ w \geq 0, \\ e^{i\pi\alpha}\overline{(-iw)^\alpha} & if\ w < 0. \end{cases} \tag{2.16}$$

It follows from (2.16) that

$$\begin{aligned}\int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} \widehat{(D^\alpha_1 f)}(\xi_1)\overline{\widehat{(D^{\alpha *}_1 f)}(\xi_1)} d\xi_1 &= \int_{-\infty}^{0} (i\xi_1)^\alpha \widehat{f^{(1)}}(\xi_1)\overline{(-i\xi_1)^\alpha \widehat{f^{(1)}}(\xi_1)} d\xi_1 \\ &\quad + \int_{0}^{+\infty} (i\xi_1)^\alpha \widehat{f^{(1)}}(\xi_1)\overline{(-i\xi_1)^\alpha \widehat{f^{(1)}}(\xi_1)} d\xi_1 \\ &= \cos(\pi\alpha)\int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} (i\xi_1)^\alpha \widehat{f^{(1)}}(\xi_1)\overline{(i\xi_1)^\alpha \widehat{f^{(1)}}(\xi_1)} d\xi_1 \\ &\quad + i\sin(\pi\alpha)\bigg(\int_{0}^{+\infty} (i\xi_1)^\alpha \widehat{f^{(1)}}(\xi_1)\overline{(i\xi_1)^\alpha \widehat{f^{(1)}}(\xi_1)} d\xi_1 \\ &\quad - \int_{-\infty}^{0} (i\xi_1)^\alpha \widehat{f^{(1)}}(\xi_1)\overline{(i\xi_1)^\alpha \widehat{f^{(1)}}(\xi_1)} d\xi_1\bigg), \end{aligned}$$

where $\widehat{f^{(1)}}(\xi_1) = \frac{1}{(2\pi)^{\frac{1}{2}}} \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} f^{(1)}(x,t) e^{-it\xi_1} dt$.

What's more, by $\overline{\widehat{f}(-\xi_1)} = \widehat{f}(\xi_1)$, we obtain that

$$\int_0^{+\infty} (i\xi_1)^\alpha \widehat{f^{(1)}}(\xi_1) \overline{(i\xi_1)^\alpha \widehat{f^{(1)}}(\xi_1)} d\xi_1 = \int_{-\infty}^0 (i\xi_1)^\alpha \widehat{f^{(1)}}(\xi_1) \overline{(i\xi_1)^\alpha \widehat{f^{(1)}}(\xi_1)} d\xi_1.$$

Therefore, we have

$$\int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} \widehat{(D_1^\alpha f)}(\xi_1) \overline{\widehat{(D_1^{\alpha *} f)}(\xi_1)} d\xi_1 = \cos(\pi\alpha) \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} (i\xi_1)^\alpha \widehat{f^{(1)}}(\xi_1) \overline{(i\xi_1)^\alpha \widehat{f^{(1)}}(\xi_1)} d\xi_1. \tag{2.17}$$

Substitute (2.17) into (2.15) yields

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} D_1^\alpha f(x) D_1^{\alpha *} f(x) dx =& \cos(\pi\alpha) \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} \left[\int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} (i\xi_1)^\alpha \widehat{f^{(1)}}(\xi_1) \overline{(i\xi_1)^\alpha \widehat{f^{(1)}}(\xi_1)} d\xi_1 \right] dx_2 dx_3 \\
=& \cos(\pi\alpha) \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} \left[\int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} \left| (i\xi_1)^\alpha \widehat{f^{(1)}}(\xi_1) \right|^2 d\xi_1 \right] dx_2 dx_3 \\
=& \cos(\pi\alpha) \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} \left[\int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} |D_1^\alpha f(x)|^2 dx_1 \right] dx_2 dx_3 \\
=& \cos(\pi\alpha) \|D_1^\alpha f\|^2_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)}.
\end{aligned} \tag{2.18}$$

In a similar way, we can prove $\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} D_j^\alpha f(x) D_j^{\alpha *} f(x) dx = \cos(\pi\alpha) \|D_j^\alpha f\|^2_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)} (j = 2, 3)$, which concludes (2.13).

Lemma 2.5. *Assume $\alpha > 0$ and $\alpha \neq m + \frac{1}{2}$, $m \in \mathbb{N}$, then $F_L^\alpha(\mathbb{R}^3)$, $F_R^\alpha(\mathbb{R}^3)$, $F_S^\alpha(\mathbb{R}^3)$ and $H^\alpha(\mathbb{R}^3)$ are equivalent.*

Proof. By Lemma 2.4, $F_S^\alpha(\mathbb{R}^3)$ and $F_L^\alpha(\mathbb{R}^3)$ are equivalent. On the other hand, by Lemma 2.3, we prove this Lemma.

Lemma 2.6. *Assume $\alpha > 0$ and $\alpha \neq m + \frac{1}{2}$, $m \in \mathbb{N}$, then $F_{S,0}^\alpha(\Omega)$ and $H_0^\alpha(\Omega)$ are equivalent.*

Proof. Let $\tilde{f}$ be extension of $f \in C_0^\infty(\Omega)$ by zero outside Ω, then $\mathrm{supp}(\tilde{f}) \subset \Omega$, where $\mathrm{supp}(\tilde{f}) = \{x : \tilde{f}(x) \neq 0\}$. What's more, $\mathrm{supp}(D_1^\alpha \tilde{f}) \subset (a_1, +\infty) \times (a_2, b_2) \times (a_3, b_3)$, $\mathrm{supp}(D_2^\alpha \tilde{f}) \subset (a_1, b_1) \times (a_2, +\infty) \times (a_3, b_3)$, $\mathrm{supp}(D_3^\alpha \tilde{f}) \subset (a_1, b_1) \times (a_2, b_2) \times (a_3, +\infty)$, $\mathrm{supp}(D_1^{\alpha *} \tilde{f}) \subset (-\infty, b_1) \times (a_2, b_2) \times (a_3, b_3)$, $\mathrm{supp}(D_2^{\alpha *} \tilde{f}) \subset (a_1, b_1) \times (-\infty, b_2) \times (a_3, b_3)$, $\mathrm{supp}(D_3^{\alpha *} \tilde{f}) \subset (a_1, b_1) \times (a_2, b_2) \times (-\infty, b_3)$.

Therefore, $\mathrm{supp}(D^\alpha \tilde{f} \cdot D^{\alpha *} \tilde{f}) \subset \Omega$. This implies,

$$\|f\|_{F_{S,0}^\alpha(\Omega)} = \|\tilde{f}\|_{F_{S,0}^\alpha(\mathbb{R}^3)}, \|f\|_{H_0^\alpha(\Omega)} = \|\tilde{f}\|_{H^\alpha(\mathbb{R}^3)}. \tag{2.19}$$

By Lemma 2.5, we obtain that $F_{S,0}^\alpha(\Omega)$ and $H_0^\alpha(\Omega)$ are equivalent. □

Based on above Lemmas, we give the main result of this section.

Theorem 2.7. *Assume $\alpha > 0$ and $\alpha \neq m + \frac{1}{2}$, $m \in \mathbb{N}$, then $F_{L,0}^\alpha(\Omega)$, $F_{R,0}^\alpha(\Omega)$ and $H_0^\alpha(\Omega)$ are equivalent.*

Proof. Let $\tilde{f}$ be extension of $f \in C_0^\infty(\Omega)$ by zero outside Ω, then

$$\begin{aligned}
\|f\|^2_{F_{L,0}^\alpha(\Omega)} =& \|f\|^2_{L^2(\Omega)} + \|\nabla^\alpha f\|^2_{L^2(\Omega)} \leq \|\tilde{f}\|^2_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)} + \|D^\alpha \tilde{f}\|^2_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)} \\
=& \|\tilde{f}\|^2_{F_L^\alpha(\mathbb{R}^3)} \leq C \|\tilde{f}\|^2_{H^\alpha(\mathbb{R}^3)} = C \|f\|^2_{H_0^\alpha(\Omega)}.
\end{aligned}$$

That is, $H_0^\alpha(\Omega) \subseteq F_{L,0}^\alpha(\Omega)$.

On the other hand, by Lemma 2.5, Lemma 2.6 and Cauchy inequality[5] $ab \le \frac{a^2}{4\varepsilon} + \varepsilon b^2$ $(\varepsilon > 0)$,

$$\begin{aligned}
|f|^2_{H^\alpha(\Omega)} \le & C|f|^2_{F^\alpha_{S,0}(\Omega)} = C\left|\int_\Omega \nabla^\alpha f(x) \cdot \nabla^{\alpha *} f(x) dx\right| \\
\le & \frac{C}{4\varepsilon}\|\nabla^\alpha f\|^2_{L^2(\Omega)} + C\varepsilon\|\nabla^{\alpha *} f\|^2_{L^2(\Omega)} \\
= & \frac{C}{4\varepsilon}|f|^2_{F^\alpha_{L,0}(\Omega)} + C\varepsilon|f|^2_{F^\alpha_{R,0}(\Omega)} \le \frac{C}{4\varepsilon}|f|^2_{F^\alpha_{L,0}(\Omega)} + C\varepsilon|\tilde{f}|^2_{F^\alpha_{R,0}(\mathbb{R}^3)} \\
\le & \frac{C}{4\varepsilon}|f|^2_{F^\alpha_{L,0}(\Omega)} + C_1\varepsilon|\tilde{f}|^2_{H^\alpha_0(\mathbb{R}^3)} = \frac{C}{4\varepsilon}|f|^2_{F^\alpha_{L,0}(\Omega)} + C_1\varepsilon|f|^2_{H^\alpha_0(\Omega)}.
\end{aligned} \tag{2.20}$$

Let $\varepsilon = \frac{1}{2C_1}$ in (2.20), then

$$|f|^2_{H^\alpha(\Omega)} \le CC_1|f|^2_{F^\alpha_{L,0}(\Omega)}. \tag{2.21}$$

That is, $F^\alpha_{L,0}(\Omega) \subseteq H^\alpha_0(\Omega)$.
Now, we conclude $F^\alpha_{L,0}(\Omega) = H^\alpha_0(\Omega)$.
Similarly, we can prove that $F^\alpha_{R,0}(\Omega)$ and $H^\alpha_0(\Omega)$ are equivalent.

3 Existence of solution to (1.6)

Definition 3.1. (cf. [4])For $\alpha > 0$, $x \in [a,b]$ and function $f : [a,b] \to \mathbb{R}$, define

$$D^{-\alpha}_{[a,x]}f(x) = \frac{1}{\Gamma(\alpha)}\int_a^x (x-t)^{\alpha-1}f(t)dt, D^{-\alpha *}_{[x,b]}f(x) = \frac{1}{\Gamma(\alpha)}\int_x^b (t-x)^{\alpha-1}f(t)dt.$$

By Appendix in [4], we know that

$$D^{-\alpha}_{[a,x]}D^{\alpha}_{[a,x]}f(x) = f(x), \quad D^{-\alpha *}_{[x,b]}D^{\alpha *}_{[x,b]}f(x) = f(x). \tag{3.1}$$

Based on Definition 3.1, for $x = (x_1, x_2, x_3) \in \Omega$, $i = 1,2,3$ and function $f : \Omega \to \mathbb{R}$, define

$$D^{-\alpha}_{[a_i,x_i]}f(x) = \frac{1}{\Gamma(\alpha)}\int_{a_i}^{x_i} (x_i-t)^{\alpha-1}f^{(i)}(x,t)dt, D^{-\alpha *}_{[x_i,b_i]}f(x) = \frac{1}{\Gamma(\alpha)}\int_{x_i}^{b_i} (t-x_i)^{\alpha-1}f^{(i)}(x,t)dt.$$

By (3.1), we know that

$$D^{-\alpha}_{[a_i,x_i]}D^{\alpha}_{[a_i,x_i]}f(x) = f(x), \quad D^{-\alpha *}_{[x_i,b_i]}D^{\alpha *}_{[x_i,b_i]}f(x) = f(x)(i = 1,2,3). \tag{3.2}$$

Based on above definitions and notations, we obtain the following property of operators $D^{-\alpha}_{[a_i,x_i]}$ and $D^{-\alpha *}_{[x_i,b_i]}(i = 1,2,3)$.

Lemma 3.1. *For $\alpha > 0$, $x = (x_1, x_2, x_3) \in \Omega$ and function $f \in L^2(\Omega)$, there exists a constant $C = C(\alpha, \Omega)$ such that*

$$\|D^{-\alpha}_{[a_i,x_i]}f\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \le C\|f\|_{L^2(\Omega)}, \|D^{-\alpha *}_{[x_i,b_i]}f\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \le C\|f\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \quad (i = 1,2,3).$$

Proof. Since $D^{-\alpha}_{[a_1,x_1]}f(x) = \frac{x_1^{\alpha-1}}{\Gamma(\alpha)} * f(x_1,x_2,x_3)$, by Young's inequality[5]

$$\|v * w\|^2_{L^2([a_1,b_1])} \le \|v\|^2_{L^1([a_1,b_1])}\|w\|^2_{L^2([a_1,b_1])}, \tag{3.3}$$

it yields,

$$\begin{aligned}
\|D^{-\alpha}_{[a_1,x_1]}f\|^2_{L^2(\Omega)} =& \int_{a_1}^{b_1}\int_{a_2}^{b_2}\int_{a_3}^{b_3}\left|D^{-\alpha}_{[a_1,x_1]}f(x_1,x_2,x_3)\right|^2 dx_3dx_2dx_1\\
=& \int_{a_2}^{b_2}\int_{a_3}^{b_3}\left[\int_{a_1}^{b_1}\left|D^{-\alpha}_{[a_1,x_1]}f(x_1,x_2,x_3)\right|^2 dx_1\right]dx_3dx_2\\
\le& \int_{a_2}^{b_2}\int_{a_3}^{b_3}\left[\frac{1}{(\Gamma(\alpha))^2}\int_{a_1}^{b_1}|f(x_1,x_2,x_3)|^2dx_1\left(\int_{a_1}^{b_1}|x_1^{\alpha-1}|dx_1\right)^2\right]dx_3dx_2\\
\le& \int_{a_2}^{b_2}\int_{a_3}^{b_3}\left[\frac{(|a_1|^\alpha+|b_1|^\alpha)^2}{(\Gamma(\alpha+1))^2}\int_{a_1}^{b_1}|f(x_1,x_2,x_3)|^2dx_1\right]dx_3dx_2\\
=& \frac{(|a_1|^\alpha+|b_1|^\alpha)^2}{(\Gamma(\alpha+1))^2}\int_{a_1}^{b_1}\int_{a_2}^{b_2}\int_{a_3}^{b_3}|f(x_1,x_2,x_3)|^2dx_3dx_2dx_1\\
=& \frac{(|a_1|^\alpha+|b_1|^\alpha)^2}{(\Gamma(\alpha+1))^2}\|f\|^2_{L^2(\Omega)}.
\end{aligned}\tag{3.4}$$

Similarly, $\|D^{-\alpha}_{[a_i,x_i]}f\|^2_{L^2(\Omega)} \le \frac{(|a_i|^\alpha+|b_i|^\alpha)^2}{(\Gamma(\alpha+1))^2}\|f\|^2_{L^2(\Omega)}$ $(i=2,3)$.
Let $C = \max\limits_{i=1,2,3}\left\{\frac{|a_i|^\alpha+|b_i|^\alpha}{\Gamma(\alpha+1)}\right\}$, then

$$\|D^{-\alpha}_{[a_i,x_i]}f\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \le C\|f\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \quad (i=1,2,3). \tag{3.5}$$

In a similar way, we can prove that

$$\|D^{-\alpha*}_{[x_i,b_i]}f\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \le C\|f\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \quad (i=1,2,3). \tag{3.6}$$

Lemma 3.2. *Assume $\alpha > 0$, $u \in F^\alpha_{L,0}(\Omega)$ and $v \in F^\alpha_{R,0}(\Omega)$, then there exists a constant $C = C(\alpha,\Omega)$ such that*

$$\|u\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \le C|u|_{F^\alpha_{L,0}(\Omega)}, \quad \|v\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \le C|v|_{F^\alpha_{R,0}(\Omega)}. \tag{3.7}$$

Proof. It follows from Lemma 3.1 and (3.2) that

$$\|u\|_{L^2(\Omega)} = \|D^{-\alpha}_{[a_j,x_j]}D^\alpha_{[a_j,x_j]}u\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \le \bar{C}\left\|\frac{\partial^\alpha u}{\partial x_j^\alpha}\right\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \quad (j=1,2,3), \tag{3.8}$$

where $\bar{C} = \bar{C}(\alpha,\Omega)$.

It follows from (3.8) that

$$\|u\|^2_{L^2(\Omega)} \le \frac{\bar{C}^2}{3}\sum_{j=1}^3\left\|\frac{\partial^\alpha u}{\partial x_j^\alpha}\right\|^2_{L^2(\Omega)} = \frac{\bar{C}^2}{3}|u|^2_{F^\alpha_{L,0}(\Omega)}. \tag{3.9}$$

Let $C = \frac{\bar{C}}{\sqrt{3}}$, this concludes the first equation of (3.7).
Similarly, we can prove the second equation of (3.7).

Lemma 3.3. *Assume $\alpha > 2.5$, $\alpha \neq m+0.5$, $m \in \mathbb{N}$ and $u \in F^{\alpha}_{L,0}(\Omega)$, then there exists a constant $K = K(\alpha, \Omega)$ such that*

(i). $\|u(x) - u(y)\| \leq K\|\nabla^{\alpha} u\|_{L^2(\Omega)}\|x - y\|$.

(ii). $\|\nabla u(x) - \nabla u(y)\| \leq K\|\nabla^{\alpha} u\|_{L^2(\Omega)}\|x - y\|^{\lambda}$, *where* $0 < \lambda \leq \alpha - 1.5 - [\alpha - 1.5]$ *as* $2.5 < \alpha < 3.5$ *and* $\lambda = 1$ *as* $\alpha \geq 3.5$.

Proof.(i). By Theorem 2.7, $u \in F^{\alpha}_{L,0}(\Omega) = H^{\alpha}_0(\Omega) \hookrightarrow C^1(\Omega)$(cf. [2, Theorem 4.57]). This implies

$$\begin{aligned}\|u(x) - u(y)\| =& \|\nabla u(\xi) \cdot (x - y)\| \leq \|u\|_{C^1(\Omega)}\|x - y\| \leq C_1\|u\|_{H^{\alpha}_0(\Omega)}\|x - y\| \\ \leq& C_2\|u\|_{F^{\alpha}_{L,0}(\Omega)}\|x - y\|. \end{aligned} \tag{3.10}$$

On the other hand, by Lemma 3.2, we know there exists a constant $C_3 = C_3(\alpha, \Omega)$ such that

$$\|u\|_{F^{\alpha}_{L,0}(\Omega)} \leq C_3\|\nabla^{\alpha} u\|_{L^2(\Omega)}. \tag{3.11}$$

By (3.10) and (3.11), we obtain that

$$\|u(x) - u(y)\| \leq K\|\nabla^{\alpha} u\|_{L^2(\Omega)}\|x - y\|. \tag{3.12}$$

This concludes **(i)**.

(ii). Here we divide our discussion into two different cases:

Case 1$(2.5 < \alpha < 3.5)$**.** Since $F^{\alpha}_{L,0}(\Omega) = H^{\alpha}_0(\Omega) \hookrightarrow C^{1,\lambda}(\Omega)$ $(0 < \lambda < \alpha - 1.5 - [\alpha - 1.5])$[2, Theorem 4.57], then

$$\frac{\|\nabla u(x) - \nabla u(y)\|}{\|x - y\|^{\lambda}} \leq \|u\|_{C^{1,\lambda}(\Omega)} \leq C\|u\|_{F^{\alpha}_{L,0}(\Omega)} \leq K\|\nabla^{\alpha} u\|_{L^2(\Omega)}. \tag{3.13}$$

Case 2$(\alpha \geq 3.5)$**.** Since $F^{\alpha}_{L,0}(\Omega) = H^{\alpha}_0(\Omega) \hookrightarrow C^2(\Omega)$[2, Theorem 4.57], then

$$\frac{\|\nabla u(x) - \nabla u(y)\|}{\|x - y\|} \leq \|u\|_{C^2(\Omega)} \leq C\|u\|_{F^{\alpha}_{L,0}(\Omega)} \leq K\|\nabla^{\alpha} u\|_{L^2(\Omega)}. \tag{3.14}$$

This concludes **(ii)**.

By (1.6), we know H is a functional about v and η, where v and η are constrained by (1.5). In this paper, we write H as a functional only about v. Therefore, (1.5) should admit a unique solution. Otherwise, the definition of functional H is ambiguous. As to the well-define of H, we have the following result.

Lemma 3.4. *Assume $v(x, s) \in \mathcal{F}$ and $v(\cdot, s)|_{\mathbb{R}^3 \setminus \Omega} = 0$ for each $s \in [0, \tau]$, then for each $x \in \bar{\Omega}$, (1.5) admits a unique solution $\eta(s; t, x) \in C([0, \tau], \bar{\Omega})$. Moreover, for each $s \in [0, \tau]$, $\eta(s; t, x) \in [C^{[\alpha-1.5],\lambda}(\Omega)]^3$, where $0 < \lambda \leq \alpha - 1.5 - [\alpha - 1.5]$.*

Proof. Based on **(i)** in Lemma 3.3, this conclusion can be proved in a similar way with Lemma 2.2 in [6].

As to the existence of $h^{-1} : \Omega \to \Omega$, we have the following result.

Lemma 3.5. *Assume $v(x, s) \in \mathcal{F}$ and $v(\cdot, s)|_{\mathbb{R}^3 \setminus \Omega} = 0$ for each $s \in [0, \tau]$, then for $s, t \in [0, \tau]$ and $x \in \bar{\Omega}$, $\eta(s; t, x)$ defined by (1.5) is differential with respect to x. Define $\Theta(s; t, x) \triangleq \nabla_x \eta(s; t, x)$,*

then
(i).$\Theta(s;t,x)$ *is the solution of*

$$\begin{cases} \dfrac{d\Theta(s;t,x)}{ds} = \nabla_\eta v(\eta(s;t,x),s)\Theta(s;t,x), \\ \Theta(t;t,x) = I, \end{cases} \tag{3.15}$$

and

$$\det(\Theta(s;t,x)) = e^{\int_t^s \sum_{i=1}^{3} v_{i,\eta_i}(\eta(r;t,x),r)dr}, \tag{3.16}$$

where $v_{i,\eta_i}(\eta(r;t,x),r) = \frac{\partial v_i(\eta(r;t,x),r)}{\partial \eta_i}(i=1,2,3)$.
(ii). *Define* $h(x) \triangleq \eta(0;\tau,x)$ *as (1.5), then* h *is a* 1*-to-*1 *and onto mapping which ensures the existence of* $h^{-1}(x)$ *in (1.2).*

Proof. (i). Based on Theorem 2.7, this conclusion can be obtained in a similar way with Lemma 2.3 in [6].

(ii). For any $x \in \Omega$, $\det(\nabla_x h(x)) = e^{-\int_0^\tau \sum_{i=1}^{3} v_{i,\eta_i}(\eta(s;\tau,x),s)ds} \neq 0$, by Inverse Function Theorem[5, Theorem 7 in Appendix C], we know h is a 1-to-1 and onto mapping. This ensures the existence of $h^{-1}(x)$ in (1.2).

Lemma 3.6. *Assume* $\{v_n(x,s)\}$ *is a bounded sequence on* $\mathcal{F}$ *with*

$$\|v_n\|_{\mathcal{F}}^2 = \int_0^\tau \|\nabla^\alpha v_n(\cdot,s)\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 ds \leq M < +\infty, \tag{3.17}$$

and $v_n(\cdot,s)|_{\mathbb{R}^3\setminus\Omega} = 0$ *for each* $s \in [0,\tau]$*, then*

(i).$\{v_n(x,s)\}$ *is a weakly compact set on* $\mathcal{F}$*.*

(ii).*If we denote* n_k *as the sequence number of a weakly convergent subsequence* $\{v_{n_k}(x,s)\}$ *with weak limit* $v(x,s)$*, then*

$$M \geq \lim_{n_k\to\infty} \inf \int_0^\tau \|\nabla^\alpha v_{n_k}(\cdot,s)\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 ds \geq \int_0^\tau \|\nabla^\alpha v(\cdot,s)\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 ds. \tag{3.18}$$

(iii). *Let* $v_{n_k}(x,s)$*,* $v(x,s)$ *be functions defined in* **(ii)***. Consider the equations*

$$\frac{d\eta_{n_k}(s;t,x)}{ds} = v_{n_k}(\eta_{n_k}(s;t,x),s) \quad \text{with} \quad \eta_{n_k}(t;t,x) = x, \tag{3.19}$$

and

$$\frac{d\eta(s;t,x)}{ds} = v(\eta(s;t,x),s) \quad \text{with} \quad \eta(t;t,x) = x, \tag{3.20}$$

then for each $(x,t) \in \Omega\times[0,\tau]$*, these two equations have a unique solution* $\eta_{n_k}(s;t,x)$,$\eta(s;t,x) \in C([0,\tau],\bar{\Omega})$*, respectively. Furthermore, for each* $s \in [0,\tau]$*,* $\eta_{n_k}(s;t,x), \eta(s;t,x) \in [C^{[\alpha-1.5],\lambda}(\Omega)]^3$ *with* $\eta_{n_k}(s;t,x) \xrightarrow{k} \eta(s;t,x)$ *uniformly on* $[0,\tau]$*, where* $0 < \lambda \leq \alpha - 1.5 - [\alpha - 1.5]$.

Proof.(i). By Lemma 3.2, we know $\|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{F}}$ is a norm and $\mathcal{F}$ is a separable Hilbert space. This implies **(i)** for the fact that any closed ball in a separable Hilbert space is a weakly compact set.
(ii). Since $\|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{F}}$ is a norm, by the lower weak semi-continuity of norm, we obtain (3.18).

(iii). By Lemma 3.4, we know that equations (3.19) and (3.20) have a unique solution $\eta_{n_k}(s;t,x)$,$\eta(s;t,x) \in [C^{[\alpha-1.5],\lambda}(\Omega)]^3$ respectively, with $\eta_{n_k}(s;t,x) \xrightarrow{k} \eta(s;t,x)$ uniformly on $[0,\tau]$, where $0 < \lambda \leq \alpha - 1.5 - [\alpha - 1.5]$. □

Before we give a proof of Theorem 1.1, let's recall the following Lemma.

Lemma 3.7. *(cf. [9, Theorem 1.A.4])Let E be a weakly compact set on Banach space X. If $H : E \to \mathbb{R}$ is a lower weak semi-continuous*(l.w.c inshort) *functional, then there exists $v_0 \in E$ such that $H(v_0) = \inf_{v\in E} H(v)$.*

Proof of Theorem 1.1. Define function $\tilde{v}(x,s) \equiv 0$ on $\Omega \times [0,\tau]$. Since $\tilde{v}(x,s) \in \mathcal{F}$ and $H(\tilde{v}) = \|T(\cdot) - D(\cdot)\|^2_{L^2(\Omega)} \leq G|\Omega| \triangleq M$, we only need to show the existence of global minimizer of $H(v)$ on the ball

$$B_M \triangleq \{v(x,s) : \|v\|^2_{\mathcal{F}} \leq M\}. \tag{3.21}$$

By **(i)** in Lemma 3.6, we know B_M is a weakly compact set. Choose $\{v_n\} \in B_M$, then there exists a weakly convergent subsequence $\{v_{n_k}\}$ such that

$$v_{n_k} \xrightarrow{k} v \in B_M. \tag{3.22}$$

By **(ii)** in Lemma 3.6, we know that

$$M \geq \lim_{n_k\to\infty} \inf \int_0^\tau \|\nabla^\alpha v_{n_k}(\cdot,t)\|^2_{L^2(\Omega)} dt \geq \int_0^\tau \|\nabla^\alpha v(\cdot,t)\|^2_{L^2(\Omega)} dt. \tag{3.23}$$

By **(iii)** in Lemma 3.6, $\eta_{n_k}(s;t,x) \xrightarrow{k} \eta(s;t,x)$ for all $(x,s,t) \in \Omega \times [0,\tau] \times [0,\tau]$, where $\eta_{n_k}(s;t,x)$, $\eta(s;t,x)$ are the solution of (3.19) and (3.20), respectively. Furthermore, we have

$$h_{n_k}(x) = \eta_{n_k}(0;\tau,x) \xrightarrow{k} \eta(0;\tau,x) = h(x) \text{ for all } x \in \Omega. \tag{3.24}$$

Define $\Theta_{n_k}(s;0,x) \triangleq \nabla_x \eta_{n_k}(s;0,x)$, $\Theta(s;0,x) \triangleq \nabla_x \eta(s;0,x)$, then by Lemma 3.5, $\Theta_{n_k}(s;0,x)$ and $\Theta(s;0,x)$ are the solutions of

$$\begin{cases} \dfrac{d\Theta_{n_k}(s;0,x)}{ds} = \nabla_{\eta_{n_k}} v_{n_k}(\eta_{n_k}(s;0,x),s)\Theta_{n_k}(s;0,x), \\ \Theta_{n_k}(0;0,x) = I, \end{cases} \tag{3.25}$$

and

$$\begin{cases} \dfrac{d\Theta(s;0,x)}{ds} = \nabla_\eta v(\eta(s;0,x),s)\Theta(s;0,x), \\ \Theta(0;0,x) = I, \end{cases} \tag{3.26}$$

respectively.

Based on these notations, here we claim that the functional

$$H : B_M \to \mathbb{R} \text{ is l.w.c.} \tag{3.27}$$

The proof of claim (3.27) can be divided into following five steps.

Step 1. We claim that there exists a constant $0 < \tilde{M} < +\infty$ such that

$$\|\Theta_{n_k}(s;0,x)\| \leq \tilde{M}, \quad \|\Theta(s;0,x)\| \leq \tilde{M}. \tag{3.28}$$

By (3.25), we have

$$\Theta_{n_k}(s;0,x) = I + \int_0^s \nabla_{\eta_{n_k}} v_{n_k}(\eta_{n_k}(r;0,x),r)\Theta_{n_k}(r;0,x)dr, \tag{3.29}$$

this yields

$$\|\Theta_{n_k}(s;0,x)\| = \|I\| + \int_0^s \|\nabla_{\eta_{n_k}} v_{n_k}(\eta_{n_k}(r;0,x),r)\|\|\Theta_{n_k}(r;0,x)\|dr.$$

By Grownwall inequality and Lemma 3.2, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\Theta_{n_k}(s;0,x)\| \leq & \|I\|e^{\int_0^s \|\nabla_{\eta_{n_k}} v_{n_k}(\eta_{n_k}(r;0,x),r)\|dr} \leq \|I\|e^{\int_0^s \|v_{n_k}(\cdot,r)\|_{C^1(\Omega)}dr} \\
\leq & \|I\|e^{\int_0^s C\|v_{n_k}(\cdot,r)\|_{F^\alpha_{L,0}(\Omega)}dr} \leq \|I\|e^{\int_0^s \tilde{C}\|\nabla^\alpha v_{n_k}(\cdot,r)\|_{L^2(\Omega)}dr} \\
\leq & \|I\|e^{\tilde{C}\tau^{\frac{1}{2}}(\int_0^s \|\nabla^\alpha v_{n_k}(\cdot,r)\|^2_{L^2(\Omega)}dr)^{\frac{1}{2}}} \leq \|I\|e^{\tilde{C}(\tau M)^{\frac{1}{2}}} \triangleq \tilde{M}.
\end{aligned}$$

Similarly, we can prove that $\|\Theta(s;0,x)\| \leq \tilde{M}$.

Step 2. We claim that $\nabla_x \left[\int_0^s [v_{n_k}(x,r) - v(x,r)]dr\right] \xrightarrow{k} O_{3\times 3}$ uniformly on $\Omega \times [0,\tau]$, where $O_{3\times 3}$ is a 3×3 matrix whose elements are all zero.

Let $w_{n_k}(x,s) \triangleq v_{n_k}(x,s) - v(x,s)$, $z_{n_k}(x,s) \triangleq \int_0^s w_{n_k}(x,r)dr$, then $w_{n_k} \xrightarrow{k} 0$ with $\|w_{n_k}\|_{\mathcal{F}} \leq 2M$.

If $x, y \in \Omega$ and $s, t \in [0,\tau]$, then by **(i)** in Lemma 3.3,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \|z_{n_k}(x,s) - z_{n_k}(y,t)\| \\
= & \left\|\int_0^s [w_{n_k}(x,r) - w_{n_k}(y,r)]dr\right\| + \left\|\int_s^t w_{n_k}(y,r)dr\right\| \\
\leq & K\int_0^\tau \|\nabla^\alpha v_{n_k}(\cdot,r)\|_{L^2(\Omega)}dr\|x-y\| \\
& + K\int_0^\tau \|\nabla^\alpha v(\cdot,r)\|_{L^2(\Omega)}dr\|x-y\| + \left\|\int_s^t w_{n_k}(y,r)dr\right\| \\
\leq & K\tau^{\frac{1}{2}}\left(\int_0^\tau \|\nabla^\alpha v_{n_k}(\cdot,r)\|^2_{L^2(\Omega)}dr\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}\|x-y\| \\
& + K\tau^{\frac{1}{2}}\left(\int_0^\tau \|\nabla^\alpha v(\cdot,r)\|^2_{L^2(\Omega)}dr\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}\|x-y\| + \left\|\int_s^t w_{n_k}(y,r)dr\right\| \\
\leq & 2KM^{\frac{1}{2}}\tau^{\frac{1}{2}}\|x-y\| + \left\|\int_s^t w_{n_k}(y,r)dr\right\| \\
\leq & 2KM^{\frac{1}{2}}\tau^{\frac{1}{2}}\|x-y\| + C|t-s|^{\frac{1}{2}}\|w_{n_k}\|_{\mathcal{F}} \\
\leq & 2KM^{\frac{1}{2}}\tau^{\frac{1}{2}}\|x-y\| + 2CM|t-s|^{\frac{1}{2}}.
\end{aligned}$$

By Arzela-Ascoli Theorem[9], $\{z_{n_k}\}$ is relative compact on $[C(\Omega\times[0,\tau])]^3$.

By [3, 6], $z_{n_k} \xrightarrow{k} 0$ uniformly on $\Omega \times [0,\tau]$.

On the other hand, by **(ii)** in Lemma 3.3, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\|\nabla_x z_{n_k}(x,s) - \nabla_y z_{n_k}(y,t)\| \\
&= \left\| \int_0^s [\nabla_x w_{n_k}(x,r) - \nabla_y w_{n_k}(y,r)]dr \right\| + \left\| \int_s^t \nabla_y w_{n_k}(y,r)dr \right\| \\
&\le K \int_0^\tau \|\nabla^\alpha v_{n_k}(\cdot,r)\|_{L^2(\Omega)} dr \|x-y\|^\lambda \\
&+ K \int_0^\tau \|\nabla^\alpha v(\cdot,r)\|_{L^2(\Omega)} dr \|x-y\|^\lambda + \left\| \int_s^t \nabla_y w_{n_k}(y,r)dr \right\| \\
&\le K\tau^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\int_0^\tau \|\nabla^\alpha v_{n_k}(\cdot,r)\|^2_{L^2(\Omega)} dr \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \|x-y\|^\lambda
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&+ K\tau^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\int_0^\tau \|\nabla^\alpha v(\cdot,r)\|^2_{L^2(\Omega)} dr \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \|x-y\|^\lambda + \left\| \int_s^t \nabla_y w_{n_k}(y,r)dr \right\| \\
&\le 2KM^{\frac{1}{2}}\tau^{\frac{1}{2}} \|x-y\|^\lambda + \left\| \int_s^t \nabla_y w_{n_k}(y,r)dr \right\| \\
&\le 2KM^{\frac{1}{2}}\tau^{\frac{1}{2}} \|x-y\|^\lambda + |t-s|^{\frac{1}{2}} K \|w_{n_k}\|_{\mathcal{F}} \\
&\le 2KM^{\frac{1}{2}}\tau^{\frac{1}{2}} \|x-y\|^\lambda + 2MK|t-s|^{\frac{1}{2}}.
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, $\{\nabla_x z_{n_k}(x,s)\}$ is relative compact on $[C(\Omega \times [0,\tau])]^3$.
Now, choose any convergent subsequence of $\{\nabla_x z_{n_k}(x,s)\}$ with limit $P_{3\times 3}$. That is,

$$\nabla_x z_{n_k}(x,s) \xrightarrow{k} P_{3\times 3} \text{ uniformly on } \Omega \times [0,\tau]. \tag{3.30}$$

Since $z_{n_k} \xrightarrow{k} 0$ uniformly on $\Omega \times [0,\tau]$, then $P_{3\times 3} = \nabla_x 0 = O_{3\times 3}$.
This implies, $\nabla_x \left[\int_0^s [v_{n_k}(x,r) - v(x,r)]dr \right] \xrightarrow{k} O_{3\times 3}$ uniformly on $\Omega \times [0,\tau]$.

Step 3. We claim that $\|\Theta_{n_k}\Theta_{n_k}^T - \Theta\Theta^T\| \xrightarrow{k} 0$. Here for the sake of simplicity, we denote $\Theta_{n_k}(s;0,x)$ and $\Theta(s;0,x)$ by Θ_{n_k} and Θ, respectively.

$$\begin{aligned}
&\|\Theta_{n_k}(s;0,x) - \Theta(s;0,x)\| \\
&\le \int_0^s \|[\nabla_{\eta_{n_k}} v_{n_k}(\eta_{n_k}(r;0,x),r) - \nabla_\eta v_{n_k}(\eta(r;0,x),r)]\Theta_{n_k}(r;0,x)\| dr \\
&+ \int_0^s \|\nabla_\eta v_{n_k}(\eta(r;0,x),r)[\Theta_{n_k}(r;0,x) - \Theta(r;0,x)]\| dr \\
&+ \left\| \int_0^s [\nabla_\eta v_{n_k}(\eta(r;0,x),r) - \nabla_\eta v(\eta(r;0,x),r)]\Theta(r;0,x)dr \right\| \\
&\le \int_0^s K\|\nabla^\alpha v_{n_k}(\cdot,r)\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \|\eta_{n_k}(r;0,x) - \eta(r;0,x)\|^\lambda \|\Theta_{n_k}(r;0,x)\| dr \\
&+ \int_0^s \|\nabla_\eta v_{n_k}(\eta(r;0,x),r)\| \|\Theta_{n_k}(r;0,x) - \Theta(r;0,x)\| dr \\
&+ \left\| \int_0^s [\nabla_\eta v_{n_k}(\eta(r;0,x),r) - \nabla_\eta v(\eta(r;0,x),r)]\Theta(r;0,x)dr \right\|
\end{aligned}$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\le K\tilde{M}\tau^{\frac{1}{2}}\left(\int_0^s \|\nabla^\alpha v_{n_k}(\cdot,r)\|^2_{L^2(\Omega)}dr\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}\|\eta_{n_k}(r;0,x)-\eta(r;0,x)\|^\lambda_{C([0,\tau]:\overline{\Omega})}\\
&+\int_0^s \|\nabla_\eta v_{n_k}(\eta(r;0,x),r)\|\|\Theta_{n_k}(r;0,x)-\Theta(r;0,x)\|dr\\
&+\left\|\int_0^s[\nabla_\eta v_{n_k}(\eta(r;0,x),r)-\nabla_\eta v(\eta(r;0,x),r)]\Theta(r;0,x)dr\right\|\\
&\le K\tilde{M}\tau^{\frac{1}{2}}M^{\frac{1}{2}}\|\eta_{n_k}(r;0,x)-\eta(r;0,x)\|^\lambda_{C([0,\tau]:\overline{\Omega})}\\
&+\left\|\int_0^s[\nabla_\eta v_{n_k}(\eta(r;0,x),r)-\nabla_\eta v(\eta(r;0,x),r)]\Theta(r;0,x)dr\right\|\\
&+\int_0^s \|\nabla_\eta v_{n_k}(\eta(r;0,x),r)\|\|\Theta_{n_k}(r;0,x)-\Theta(r;0,x)\|dr\\
&\triangleq I_1+I_2+I_3. \qquad (3.31)
\end{aligned}
$$

On the other hand, by **(iii)** in Lemma 3.6, we have $\|\eta_{n_k}(s;0,x)-\eta(s;0,x)\|_{C([0,\tau]:\overline{\Omega})}\xrightarrow{k}0$.

This leads to $I_1\xrightarrow{k}0$. By **Step 2**, we know that $\nabla_x\left[\int_0^s v_{n_k}(x,r)-v(x,r)dr\right]\xrightarrow{k}O_{3\times3}$ uniformly on $\Omega\times[0,\tau]$. This implies that $I_2\xrightarrow{k}0$.

Hence, $I_1+I_2\xrightarrow{k}0$. Then there exist $N=N(\varepsilon)$, such that $I_1+I_2<\varepsilon$ as $n_k>N$. Therefore, it follows from (3.31) that

$$
\|\Theta_{n_k}(s;0,x)-\Theta(s;0,x)\|\le\varepsilon+\int_0^s\|\nabla_\eta v_{n_k}(\eta(r;0,x),r)\|\|\Theta_{n_k}(r;0,x)-\Theta(r;0,x)\|dr,
$$

and Gronwall inequality implies that

$$
\|\Theta_{n_k}(s;0,x)-\Theta(s;0,x)\|\le\varepsilon e^{\int_0^s\|\nabla_\eta v_{n_k}(\eta(r;0,x),r)\|dr}\le\varepsilon e^{K\tau^{\frac{1}{2}}(\int_0^\tau\|\nabla^\alpha v_{n_k}(\cdot,r)\|^2_{L^2(\Omega)}dr)^{\frac{1}{2}}}\le\varepsilon e^{K\tau^{\frac{1}{2}}M^{\frac{1}{2}}}.
$$

Let $\varepsilon\to0$, then $\Theta_{n_k}(s;0,x)\xrightarrow{k}\Theta(s;0,x)$. Then,

$$
\begin{aligned}
\|\Theta_{n_k}\Theta^T_{n_k}-\Theta\Theta^T\|&\le\|\Theta_{n_k}\Theta^T_{n_k}-\Theta\Theta^T_{n_k}\|+\|\Theta\Theta^T_{n_k}-\Theta\Theta^T\|\\
&\le\|\Theta_{n_k}-\Theta\|\|\Theta^T_{n_k}\|+\|\Theta\|\|\Theta^T_{n_k}-\Theta^T\|\\
&\le\tilde{M}\|\Theta_{n_k}-\Theta\|+\tilde{M}\|\Theta^T_{n_k}-\Theta^T\|\xrightarrow{k}0, \qquad (3.32)
\end{aligned}
$$

since $\Theta_{n_k}\xrightarrow{k}\Theta$ and $\Theta^T_{n_k}\xrightarrow{k}\Theta^T$.

Step 4. We claim that $R_{n_k}\xrightarrow{k}R$.

Define $A_{n_k}=\Theta_{n_k}(\tau;0,x)\Theta^T_{n_k}(\tau;0,x)=\left(\ a^{n_k}_{ij}(\tau;0,x)\ \right)_{3\times3}$, $A=\Theta(\tau;0,x)\Theta^T(\tau;0,x)=\left(\ a_{ij}(\tau;0,x)\ \right)_{3\times3}$.

By (3.32), we know $a^{n_k}_{ij}(\tau;0,x)\xrightarrow{k}a_{ij}(\tau;0,x)$ for $i,j=1,2,3$. Now, we simply denote $a^{n_k}_{ij}(\tau;0,x)$ and $a_{ij}(\tau;0,x)$ by $a^{n_k}_{ij}$ and a_{ij}, respectively.

By Lemma 3.5, we obtain that

$$
\det(\Theta_{n_k}(\tau;0,x))=e^{-\int_0^\tau\sum\limits_{i=1}^3(v_{n_k}(\eta_{n_k}(s;0,x),s))_{i,(\eta_{n_k})_i}ds}\neq0. \qquad (3.33)
$$

By (3.33), we know that $\Theta_{n_k}\Theta_{n_k}^T, \Theta\Theta^T \in SPD(3)$. Let $\lambda_{n_k}^{(1)} \geq \lambda_{n_k}^{(2)} \geq \lambda_{n_k}^{(3)} > 0$, $\lambda^{(1)} \geq \lambda^{(2)} \geq \lambda^{(3)} > 0$ be the eigenvalues of $\Theta_{n_k}\Theta_{n_k}^T, \Theta\Theta^T$, respectively.

What's more, by (3.33), we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned}\det(A_{n_k}) =& e^{-2\int_0^\tau \sum_{i=1}^{3}(v_{n_k}(\eta_{n_k}(s;t,x),s))_{i,(\eta_{n_k})_i}ds} \leq e^{2\int_0^\tau \|\nabla v(\cdot,s)\|ds} \leq e^{2\int_0^\tau \|v_{n_k}(\cdot,s)\|_{[C^1(\Omega)]^3}ds}\\ \leq& e^{2C\int_0^\tau \|v_{n_k}(\cdot,s)\|_{[F^\alpha_{L,0}(\Omega)]^3}ds} \leq e^{2K\int_0^\tau \|\nabla^\alpha v_{n_k}(\cdot,s)\|_{L^2(\Omega)}ds} \leq e^{2K\tau^{\frac{1}{2}}[\int_0^\tau \|\nabla^\alpha v_{n_k}(\cdot,s)\|^2_{L^2(\Omega)}ds]^{\frac{1}{2}}}\\ \leq& e^{2K\tau^{\frac{1}{2}}M^{\frac{1}{2}}} \triangleq M_1 < +\infty. \end{aligned} \tag{3.34}$$

In a similar way, we can obtain that

$$\det(A_{n_k}) \geq \frac{1}{M_1}. \tag{3.35}$$

By singularity decomposition theorem[7], we can find two 3×3 orthogonal matrix U_{n_k}, V_{n_k} such that $\Theta_{n_k} = U_{n_k}S_{n_k}V_{n_k}^T$, where $S_{n_k} = \text{diag}\left(\sqrt{\lambda_{n_k}^{(1)}}, \sqrt{\lambda_{n_k}^{(2)}}, \sqrt{\lambda_{n_k}^{(3)}}\right)$, the columns of U_{n_k}, V_{n_k} are orthogonal eigenvectors of $\Theta_{n_k}\Theta_{n_k}^T$ and $\Theta_{n_k}^T\Theta_{n_k}$, respectively.

Similarly, $\Theta = USV^T$, where $S = \text{diag}\left(\sqrt{\lambda^{(1)}}, \sqrt{\lambda^{(2)}}, \sqrt{\lambda^{(3)}}\right)$, the columns of U, V are orthogonal eigenvectors of $\Theta\Theta^T$ and $\Theta^T\Theta$, respectively.

Then, $A_{n_k} = \Theta_{n_k}\Theta_{n_k}^T = U_{n_k}S_{n_k}^2U_{n_k}^T$, $A_{n_k}^{-1} = U_{n_k}S_{n_k}^{-2}U_{n_k}^T$ and $A = \Theta\Theta^T = US^2U^T$, $A^{-1} = US^{-2}U^T$. Hence,

$$\begin{aligned}\|A_{n_k}^{-1}\| \leq& \|U_{n_k}\|\|S_{n_k}^{-2}\|\|U_{n_k}^T\| \leq \|U_{n_k}\|^2\left[\frac{1}{\lambda_{n_k}^{(1)}} + \frac{1}{\lambda_{n_k}^{(2)}} + \frac{1}{\lambda_{n_k}^{(3)}}\right]\\ \leq& \|U_{n_k}\|^2\frac{\lambda_{n_k}^{(1)}\lambda_{n_k}^{(2)} + \lambda_{n_k}^{(1)}\lambda_{n_k}^{(3)} + \lambda_{n_k}^{(2)}\lambda_{n_k}^{(3)}}{\lambda_{n_k}^{(1)}\lambda_{n_k}^{(2)}\lambda_{n_k}^{(3)}} = \|U_{n_k}\|^2\frac{\lambda_{n_k}^{(1)}\lambda_{n_k}^{(2)} + \lambda_{n_k}^{(1)}\lambda_{n_k}^{(3)} + \lambda_{n_k}^{(2)}\lambda_{n_k}^{(3)}}{\det(A_{n_k})}\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}\leq& \|U_{n_k}\|^2\frac{[\lambda_{n_k}^{(1)} + \lambda_{n_k}^{(2)} + \lambda_{n_k}^{(3)}]^2}{\det(A_{n_k})} = \|U_{n_k}\|^2\frac{[\text{tr}(A_{n_k})]^2}{\det(A_{n_k})} \leq \|U_{n_k}\|^2\frac{\|A_{n_k}\|^2}{\det(A_{n_k})}\\ \leq& 27\tilde{M}^2M_1 \triangleq M_2 < +\infty, \end{aligned} \tag{3.36}$$

by (3.34), (3.35) and **Step 1**, where $\text{tr}(A)$ denote the trace of matrix A. Note that here we use the equalities

$$\lambda_{n_k}^{(1)} + \lambda_{n_k}^{(2)} + \lambda_{n_k}^{(3)} \equiv \text{tr}(A_{n_k}),\ \lambda_{n_k}^{(1)}\lambda_{n_k}^{(2)}\lambda_{n_k}^{(3)} \equiv \det(A_{n_k}). \tag{3.37}$$

Similarly , we know that $\|A^{-1}\| \leq M_2$.

By (3.36), we obtain that

$$\|A_{n_k}^{-1} - A^{-1}\| = \|A_{n_k}^{-1}(A - A_{n_k})A^{-1}\| \leq \|A_{n_k}^{-1}\|\|A - A_{n_k}\|\|A^{-1}\| \xrightarrow{k} 0, \tag{3.38}$$

since $A - A_{n_k} = \Theta_{n_k}\Theta_{n_k}^T - \Theta\Theta^T \xrightarrow{k} 0$ by (3.32).

Hence, $A_{n_k}^{-1} \xrightarrow{k} A^{-1}$.

Since $A_{n_k}^{-1} = U_{n_k} S_{n_k}^{-2} U_{n_k}^T = \left[U_{n_k} S_{n_k}^{-1} U_{n_k}^T\right]\left[U_{n_k} S_{n_k}^{-1} U_{n_k}^T\right] \triangleq B_{n_k} B_{n_k}$, $A^{-1} = US^{-2}U^T = \left[US^{-1}U^T\right]\left[US^{-1}U^T\right] \triangleq BB$, then $B_{n_k}, B \in SPD(3)$. Then, the Minkowskii inequality[15, Equation (1.1)] implies

$$[\det(B_{n_k} + B)]^{\frac{1}{3}} \geq [\det(B_{n_k})]^{\frac{1}{3}} + [\det(B)]^{\frac{1}{3}} \geq [\det(B)]^{\frac{1}{3}}. \tag{3.39}$$

This is, $\det(B_{n_k} + B) \geq \det(B) = \frac{1}{\lambda^{(1)}\lambda^{(2)}\lambda^{(3)}} > 0$.
Further more, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\|B_{n_k} + B\| \leq & \|B_{n_k}\| + \|B\| \leq \|U_{n_k}\|^2 \left[\frac{1}{\sqrt{\lambda_{n_k}^{(1)}}} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{\lambda_{n_k}^{(2)}}} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{\lambda_{n_k}^{(3)}}}\right] \\
& + \|U\|^2 \left[\frac{1}{\sqrt{\lambda^{(1)}}} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{\lambda^{(2)}}} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{\lambda^{(3)}}}\right] \\
\leq & \|U_{n_k}\|^2 \frac{\lambda_{n_k}^{(1)} + \lambda_{n_k}^{(2)} + \lambda_{n_k}^{(3)}}{\sqrt{\lambda_{n_k}^{(1)}\lambda_{n_k}^{(2)}\lambda_{n_k}^{(3)}}} + \|U\|^2 \frac{\lambda^{(1)} + \lambda^{(2)} + \lambda^{(3)}}{\sqrt{\lambda^{(1)}\lambda^{(2)}\lambda^{(3)}}} \\
= & \|U_{n_k}\|^2 \frac{\mathrm{tr}(A_{n_k})}{\sqrt{\det(A_{n_k})}} + \|U\|^2 \frac{\mathrm{tr}(A)}{\sqrt{\det(A)}} \\
\leq & 9M_2\sqrt{M_1} + 9M_2\sqrt{M_1} \leq 18M_2\sqrt{M_1} \triangleq M_3 < +\infty.
\end{aligned} \tag{3.40}$$

By (3.38), we obtain that

$$A_{n_k}^{-1} - A^{-1} = B_{n_k}^2 - B^2 = (B_{n_k} + B)(B_{n_k} - B) \xrightarrow{k} 0. \tag{3.41}$$

By (3.41) and Lemma 2.5 in [6], we obtain that $(\Theta_{n_k}\Theta_{n_k}^T)^{-\frac{1}{2}} = B_{n_k} \xrightarrow{k} B = (\Theta\Theta^T)^{-\frac{1}{2}}$. This yields

$$\begin{aligned}
& \|\Theta_{n_k}(\Theta_{n_k}\Theta_{n_k}^T)^{-\frac{1}{2}} - \Theta(\Theta\Theta^T)^{-\frac{1}{2}}\| \\
\leq & \|\Theta_{n_k}\|\|(\Theta_{n_k}\Theta_{n_k}^T)^{-\frac{1}{2}} - (\Theta\Theta^T)^{-\frac{1}{2}}\| + \|\Theta_{n_k} - \Theta\|\|(\Theta\Theta^T)^{-\frac{1}{2}}\| \xrightarrow{k} 0.
\end{aligned} \tag{3.42}$$

So, $R_{n_k} \xrightarrow{k} R$.
Step 5. We claim that $\|T \diamond h_{n_k}(\cdot) - D(\cdot)\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 \xrightarrow{k} \|T \diamond h(\cdot) - D(\cdot)\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2$.
Let $x \in \Omega \setminus h^{-1}(\Delta_T)$, by (3.24) and **Step 4**, it yields

$$\begin{aligned}
\|T \diamond h_{n_k}(x) - T \diamond h(x)\| &= \|R_{n_k}[T \circ h_{n_k}(x)]R_{n_k}^T - R[T \circ h(x)]R^T\| \\
&\leq \|R_{n_k}[T \circ h_{n_k}(x)]R_{n_k}^T - R[T \circ h_{n_k}(x)]R_{n_k}^T\| \\
&+ \|R[T \circ h_{n_k}(x)]R_{n_k}^T - R[T \circ h(x)]R_{n_k}^T\| \\
&+ \|R[T \circ h(x)]R_{n_k}^T - R[T \circ h(x)]R^T\| \\
&\leq \|R_{n_k} - R\|\|T \circ h_{n_k}(x)\|\|R_{n_k}^T\| \\
&+ \|R\|\|T \circ h_{n_k}(x) - T \circ h(x)\|\|R_{n_k}^T\| \\
&+ \|R\|\|T \circ h(x)\|\|R_{n_k}^T - R^T\| \xrightarrow{k} 0.
\end{aligned} \tag{3.43}$$

This implies, $\|T \diamond h_{n_k}(x) - D(x)\|^2 \xrightarrow{k} \|T \diamond h(x) - D(x)\|^2$ for all $x \in \Omega \setminus h^{-1}(\Delta_T)$.

On the other hand, $\|T \diamond h_{n_k}(\cdot) - D(\cdot)\|^2 \leq \max_{x\in\Omega} \|T(x) - D(x)\|^2 = G \in L^1(\Omega)$. Besides, by **(ii)** in Lemma 3.5, $h^{-1}(\Delta_T)$ is a set of measure 0. Now by Dominance Theorem[5, Theorem 5 in Appendix E], it yields

$$\|T \diamond h_{n_k}(\cdot) - D(\cdot)\|^2_{L^2(\Omega)} \xrightarrow{k} \|T \diamond h(\cdot) - D(\cdot)\|^2_{L^2(\Omega)}. \tag{3.44}$$

It follows from (3.23) and (3.44) that, $H(v)$ is a l.w.c functional. That is,

$$\lim_{n_k\to\infty} \inf H(v_{n_k}) \geq H(v). \tag{3.45}$$

This concludes the claim (3.27).

By Lemma 3.7, there exists a global minimizer $\bar{v}(x,s) \in B_M$ such that $H(\bar{v}) = \inf_{v\in B_M} H(v) = \inf_{v\in\mathcal{F}} H(v) = \min_{v\in\mathcal{F}} H(v)$. That is, $\bar{v}(x,s)$ is a solution of (1.6).

For the above minimizer $\bar{v}(x,s) \in \mathcal{F}$, by Lemma 3.4, we know that there exists a unique $\bar{\eta}(s;t,x) \in C([0,\tau],\bar{\Omega})$ such that

$$\frac{d\bar{\eta}(s;t,x)}{ds} = \bar{v}(\bar{\eta}(s;t,x),s), \qquad \bar{\eta}(t;t,x) = x. \tag{3.46}$$

Furthermore, by Lemma 3.4 and (1.5), we know the mapping $\bar{h}(x) = \bar{\eta}(0;\tau,x) \in [C^{[\alpha-1.5],\lambda}(\Omega)]^3$ with $\nabla_x\bar{h}(x)$ given by Lemma 3.5, where $0 < \lambda < \alpha - [\alpha]$. Moreover, by **(ii)** in Lemma 3.5, we know $\bar{h}$ is a 1-to-1 and onto mapping. □

Acknowledgements. This paper is partially based on some results of my P.H.D dissertation supervised by Professor Huan-Song Zhou in Wuhan Institute of Physics and Mathematics, Chinese Academy of Sciences.

References

[1] Alexander D C, Pierpaoli C, Basser P J, Gee J C. Spatial transformations of diffusion tensor magnetic resonance images. IEEE Transaction on Medical imaging, 2001, **20**: 1131-1139

[2] Demengel F, Demengel G. Functional Spaces for the Theory of Elliptic Partial Differential Equations. Springer, 2011: 219-224

[3] Dupuis P, Grenander U, Miller M I. Variational problems on flows of diffeomorphisms for image matching. Quarterly of Applied Mathematics, 1998, **6**: 587-600

[4] Ervin V J, Roop J P. Variational formulation for the stationary fractional advection dispersion equation. Numerical Method for Partial Differential Equations, 2006, **22**: 558-576

[5] Evans L C. Partial differential equations. American Mathematical Society, Berkeley, 1997

[6] Han H, Zhou H. A variational problem arising in registration of diffusion tensor image. to appear on Acta Mathematical Scientia, arXiv:1611.07316

[7] Johnson C R, Okubo K, Reams R. Uniqueness of matrix square roots and application. Linear Algebra and it applications, 2001, **323**: 51-60

[8] Li J, Shi Y, Tran G, Dinov I, Wang D JJ, Toga A. Fast local trust region for diffusion tensor registration using exact reorientation and regularization. IEEE Transaction on Medical imaging, 2014, **33**(5): 1-43

[9] Li R, Zhong S, Swartz C. An improvement of the Arzela-Ascoli theorem. Topology and its applications, 2012, **159(8)**: 2058-2061

[10] O'Sullivan F. The analysis of some penalized likelihood schemes. Statistics Department Technical Report No.726, University of Wisconsin, 1983

[11] Podlubny. Fractional Differential Equations: An introduction to Fractional Derivatives, Fractional Differential Equations, to Methods of Their Solution and some of Their Applications. Math. Sci. Eng. Elservier Science, 1999

[12] Teschl G. Ordinary differential equations and Dynamical systems. American Mathematical Society, 2012

[13] Wang H, Du N. Fast solution methods for space-fractional diffusion equations. Journal of Computational and Applied Mathematics, 2014, **255**: 376-383

[14] Yeo T, Vercauteren T, Ficlard P, Peyrat J, Pennec X, Golland P, Ayache N, Clatz O. DTREFinD: Diffusion tensor registration with exact finite-strain differential. IEEE Transaction on Medical imaging, 2009, **28(12)**: 1914-1928

[15] Zhan S. On the determinantal inequalities. Journal of Inequalities in Pure and Applied Mathematics. 2005, **6(4)**: 1-7

[16] Zhang J, Chen K. Variational image registration by a total fractional-order variation model. Journal of Computational Physics, 2015, **293**: 442-461